



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mens and valuable papers to the French museums and scientific journals. In France he found employment at once in his own field and did much good work. He was employed in the museum of natural history in the Jardin des Plantes, and in 1845 was made curator of the new Havre Natural History Museum; he died in Havre after two years of service.

A memoir of Lesueur was read by George Ord before the American Philosophical Society, April 6, 1849, and published in the *American Journal of Science and Arts*, Second Series, VIII, 189-216. Lesueur's papers and drawings were divided between the museums of Paris and Havre; among them were forty boxes containing his collections; his manuscript zoölogical notes filled forty portfolios. Dr. Hamy, of the museum of Paris, has written for the Society of Americanists of Paris a sketch of Lesueur's life and work in America, and this sketch is now printed at the expense of the Duc de Loubat as a contribution to the meeting of scientific congresses at St. Louis. It is dedicated to the scientific societies of the United States as a tribute to the work of French explorers and naturalists in this country, and deserves the grateful acknowledgment of American scientists.

Lesueur had planned some large books; these, however, were never published, but his biography is accompanied by a bibliography of his writings published during his stay in America, showing that he left a long record of good work. An indefatigable draftsman, Lesueur made many sketches during his frequent journeys in this country; twenty-seven of his most interesting drawings, lithographs, and engravings are reproduced in this account of his life and work, adding greatly to its value and interest. The English quotations and references are full of proof-reader's mistakes, which mar a volume otherwise worthy of the subject.

J. G. ROSENGARTEN.

A History of Modern England. By HERBERT PAUL. In five volumes. Vols. I and II. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. vii, 450; vi, 446.)

THE stream of memoirs and biography and special studies which has long been pouring from the press gives us fair warning of the fact which books like those of Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Bright, Sir Spencer Walpole, and these volumes by Mr. Paul are the earliest expression. The nineteenth century, and, in English affairs, the Victorian era, now belong to the ages and to the historian. The borders of the historical field, not so long ago bounded by 1815 or 1832, have been pushed to the middle of the century, to the Berlin Congress, and have now definitely extended themselves to the end of Victoria's reign or of the century; and what was so recently politics that we can scarce think of it as anything else now appears in a new and not always well-fitting guise, as the advance-guard of histories makes its entry. Few if any of these have been on such a scale and with such a field as this now before us. It begins with

a chapter on "The Last Whig Government", specifically with the accession of Lord John Russell as prime minister on June 29, 1846, and the two volumes already issued bring the story down to the death of Lord Palmerston on October 18, 1865. Such a scale, it will be seen, is great enough to admit much detail and form a fairly comprehensive treatment of even this full period. The plan of the work is stated by Mr. Paul in his introduction with characteristic vigor. Following Lord Ellenborough's saying, he declares for chronological order. "History", ran Freeman's famous dictum, "is past politics". "History", Mr. Paul tacitly retorts in these volumes, "is past news", and news is of course chronological. More than a quarter of a century ago the author of the *History of England since the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815* wrote that, by taking up his work in the topical or logical order, he at least avoided the criticism that he had adopted the easier method. That criticism the present author is not only prepared to face, but in a measure courts. Paragraphs follow each other in a rapid succession of likes or of contrasts, with the result that from time to time the history thus written passes before us not unlike that journalistic panorama called Notes of the Day, in which human ingenuity strains to find some connecting link between the apparently irreconcilable contents of succeeding paragraphs. One instance will suffice. The author is describing the events of Parliament in 1852 (I, 265). "Protection", concludes the paragraph, "was not merely dead. It was buried." And the following paragraph begins, "So was the French Republic", whence ensues a discussion of the assumption of the imperial title by Napoleon III. Such abrupt transition as this somewhat extreme case is not seldom disconcerting, yet whether from Mr. Paul's cleverness, from our own newspaper-reading habits, or from the very nearness of events precluding philosophy and to some extent perspective, the general result is by no means unpleasing, and there comes in time, after the first strangeness has worn off, a certain tendency to pity, then endure, and perhaps, after five volumes, to embrace. The style does much to reconcile one to this. This is history written by a journalist, and it partakes, in consequence, of the merits and defects which go to make up the intellectual equipment of that profession. And whatever drawbacks one may remark in the demands of a vocation which by its very nature precludes many qualities useful to an historian — impartial judgment, or statement of facts and positions without judgments, leisurely and deliberate consideration of cause and effect, the insight which comes from long consideration — we may not deny to journalism its great virtues. Mr. Paul's book exhibits these in a high degree. It is clear, vigorous, and direct. Its movement is rapid, its interest seldom lags. It is preëminently readable, and, as a natural corollary, highly entertaining.

As to the content of the book, politics naturally bulks large in these pages, and the House of Commons fills the foreground. On the other hand, much attention is given to the church, and an unusual amount to the law. There are, as well, chapters on art, literature, and science.

The material progress of the country is, on the whole, kept in the background, and we are not deafened by the clang of machinery nor bewildered by an array of statistics; perhaps, in view of the importance of such things to-day, not enough is said of these matters. The reason advanced for such omission is that the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. This is clever enough, but it scarcely applies to many things found in the ensuing pages. Party struggle and Commons divisions, even legislation itself, form inadequate basis for such a defense, beside general social and economic change.

There is no time here to discuss the great question as to whether or not the historian should be a judge. In any event Mr. Paul decides that for himself and us with directness and force, and it is on that side of his book that the greatest criticism is likely to arise. He pronounces at the outset for judgment and opinion. "Perfect impartiality", he admits, "implies omniscience, and is not human but divine. To extenuate nothing, to set down nought in malice, to consider always the actions of men from their own point of view before passing judgment upon them, and not to expect from fallible mortals a fore-knowledge of things, is the elementary duty of the historian" (p. 21). The historian, moreover, he says, must have his opinions like other people, and it is his duty to express them. These are brave words, and such an ideal carried to perfection would do much to produce great work. Yet there lies in them a danger, which Mr. Paul has not been able wholly to avoid. Where opinions are based on exhaustive study and intimate knowledge they are of great value. But in such a work as this, which contains a multitude of opinions on a multitude of men and matters, it is inevitable that many cannot be based on that first-hand knowledge which alone gives weight. Mr. Paul disclaims omniscience, and it would be unfair to judge all of his clever instantaneous photographs and thumb-nail sketches by the standards of historical portraiture. Many are obviously incomplete, but they are enough; they illustrate the text. On the whole, however one's own opinions of the characters and events on which Mr. Paul passes judgment must differ in individual cases from his, those opinions on English men and affairs seem generally well-informed and fair. Here he has the advantage of that great body of knowledge and tradition which is the heritage of every well-informed Englishman, and his political views, which would appear from his pages to be those of an imperialist free-trader, give him a foot in each of the older camps. But where one passes from the safe haven of English politics into the strange lands, the same cannot be said. Deprived of his former support and in unfamiliar and often unfriendly fields, with insufficient bases for judgment, his opinions and especially his estimates of character are often improbable, not infrequently absurd. Here his judgments seem to argue too often a hasty and imperfect knowledge of the facts, a conclusion borne out here and there by the number and the character of the works cited as references, upon which presumably those opinions are in some sort based. Two instances which perhaps best illustrate these are those

which will doubtless be seized upon by even the most casual reader — the character of Napoleon III and that of Jefferson Davis. One might almost have believed the ogre extinct in the world of historical writing since Macaulay's Tyrconnel, were it not for the portrait of Napoleon III here set forth by Mr. Paul. In his hands that monarch becomes a composite of his great uncle's bogey, a midnight conspirator, and Hugo's Napoleon the Little. Many phrases bear this out; one, in which we are told of the prince consort that "he saw through the superficial qualities of the French Emperor to the hollow and treacherous depths below" (II, 313), will suffice. The character and the acts of Napoleon III may perhaps deserve much censure, yet such phrases do little to explain or illuminate that character, and still less to make clear to the reader the causes and circumstances which allowed this monster to become the head of a great nation. Nor does his characterization of the president of the Confederacy as "a man of no account" and a "puppet chief" (II, 297-341), besides its absurdity, do more than confuse us, as in the case of Napoleon III, as to the situation and motives of a community which raised him to the highest place in government. It is, in short, more than the damning of an individual, it is in each case the indictment of a people. Such methods add neither to our knowledge nor, still less, to our understanding of great movements. This, as has been said, will probably remain the most serious criticism of a book in most other ways excellent. Such work as that of Mr. Paul may not be judged by the standards of final and definitive statement. Years which bring not alone the philosophical mind, but the necessary information, as yet buried in archives and letter-books and diaries, must elapse before we can come to that maturer judgment we call historical.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

A History of England. By the Rev. J. FRANCK BRIGHT, D.D. Period V. *Imperial Reaction, Victoria, 1880-1901.* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. xv, 295.)

AFTER an interval of many years since its inception, the final volume in that history of England which has long found favor as the best of its compass finally appears, bringing the story down almost to the present time. The qualities of the earlier volumes are here still apparent. A certain plainness, almost austerity of style; a directness of narrative; few excursions and those never dictated by a search for the picturesque; a reliance on the subject rather than on style or ornament to sustain the interest; a great body of information clearly arranged; and impartiality of statement and reserve of judgment have been common to the preceding volumes. But as the narrative now approaches completion, as many of the characters depicted still live, and many events are still in suspense, such traits as described come into more and more prominent relief. An author treating of a transition stage between politics and history must needs remember the warning given long ago by Sir Walter Raleigh, that